



COPY OF PAPERS  
ORIGINALLY FILED

#5  
1165-012  
EP#2002  
PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Dipankar Gupta	)	Examiner: Firmin Backer	Art No.: 3621
	)		
Application No: 10/052,363	)	<b>RESPONSE</b>	
	)		
Filed: January 18, 2002	)	Our Ref: 619037-4/RPB B-3592DIV	
	)		
For: "Document Transfer Systems"	)	Your Ref: 30970137 US	
	)		
	)	Date: August 29, 2002	
	)		

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

√ This paper is filed in response to the official action dated July 29, 2002.

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 09 2002  
**GROUP 3600**

**REMARKS**

In the official action the Examiner sets forth a restriction requirement asserting that claims 1-2, 17 and 18 directed to a cryptographic method, lack unity with claims 7, and 10-13 directed to a printer.

The Examiner asserts that inventions reflected by the two groups of claims are unrelated. With all due respect to the Examiner, it is asserted that the Examiner is mistaken. The inventions are indeed related. Note that independent claim 7, which the Examiner states "is drawn to a printer" includes in sub-paragraph (c) thereof "an element for decrypting an encrypted document transmitted thereto in accordance with an encryption key defined...".

It is understood that the claims are sufficiently related that it will not be an undue burden for the